

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 287

VT 019 767

AUTHOR Rossiter, Leo P.
TITLE Learning Resources for the Disadvantaged Student.
Progress Report.
INSTITUTION Virginia Community Coll. System, Richmond.
SPONS AGENCY Virginia State Dept. of Education, Richmond. Div. of
Vocational Education.
PUB DATE Jul 72
NCIE 74p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Action Research; *Community Colleges; *Disadvantaged
Youth; Educational Philosophy; Educational Research;
*Educational Resources; Junior Colleges; Post
Secondary Education; Student Needs; Student
Placement; *Vocational Education; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

In this action research project, a series of workshops was planned and held in order to: (1) develop improved methods for placement of disadvantaged students in occupational-technical programs in the Virginia community college system, (2) identify learning resources to meet individual needs, and (3) structure the learning resources so that the disadvantaged student will have an opportunity for academic and occupational success. Overall, there emerged from the workshop sessions an acknowledgement of the magnitude and complexity of the problem and the need to work toward a solution. There was evidence suggesting that the stated mission of providing developmental studies within the community college system was not receiving the necessary degree of emphasis in learning resources. Many felt that until a stronger philosophical educational commitment is made to the needs of the disadvantaged, both systemwide and institutionwide, minimal success can be achieved. Other areas of concern were: (1) use of existing testing and placement devices, (2) regular learning time blocks as opposed to unrestrained learning time, (3) grading practices, and (4) effective teaching/counseling methods and techniques. It was suggested by the participants that future efforts be devoted to the development of three or four model programs. The research proposal and some workshop materials are appended. (SB)

ED 074287

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LEARNING RESOURCES FOR THE DISADVANTAGED STUDENT

PROGRESS REPORT

By

Leo P. Rossiter
Project Director

July, 1972

VT019767

CONTENTS

SECTION 1: GENERAL DESCRIPTION

- (A) TITLE OF THE PROJECT
- (B) STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
- (C) HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

SECTION 2: OUTCOMES AND PROBLEMS

SECTION 3: FUTURE DIRECTIONS

SECTION 1

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

- a. Title of the Project: "Learning Resources for the Disadvantaged Student"

For purposes of this report, Learning Resources are defined as those aspects of the institution which are supportive of instruction, including human resources (faculty, counselors, testing staff, and administrators), library resources, educational media and learning laboratories.

The definition of the disadvantaged student is the one currently in use in federal vocational education programs:

"Disadvantaged persons" means persons who have academic, socio-economic, cultural, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in vocational education or consumer and homemaking programs designed for persons without such handicaps, and who for that reason require specially designed educational programs or related services. The term includes persons whose needs for such programs or services result from poverty, neglect, delinquency, or cultural or linguistic isolation from the community at large, but does not include physically or mentally handicapped persons unless such persons also suffer from the handicaps described in this paragraph.

For purposes of this project, this definition was narrowed to "academic handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in ... education."

- b. Statement of the Problem

Developmental programs are offered to prepare individuals for admission to occupational-technical and college transfer programs in the community college. These programs are designed

¹Federal Register, Vol. 35, No. 91, Part II, Chapter I Subpart A, Section 102.3.

to develop the basic skills and understandings necessary to succeed in the other programs of the community college. Approximately 75 percent of people completing developmental programs enter into occupational-technical programs.

However, a less than adequate job has been done to define the placement and insure the progress of the disadvantaged occupational-technical student from the point of entrance, through the instructional experiences of the program, and into successful employment. Implicit to the nature of the statewide System are the widely varied population characteristics of the regions served by each college. Accordingly, systemwide needs researched and identified may require varying solutions to best satisfy the localized emphasis desire.

c. History of the Project

Confronted with this problem, the Director of Curriculum and Instruction for the Virginia Department of Community Colleges called a meeting of Learning Resource personnel from various colleges within the System. The purpose of this meeting, called on May 10-11, 1971 at Richmond, was to develop content for a federal proposal to fund a series of learning resource workshops.

The specific objectives of this committee were:

1. To specify the number and type of workshops
which should be held for 1971-72 and 1972-73.
2. Identify the specific objectives of these workshops;
the overall objective to be the setting of directions

for the future of Learning Resources for the Virginia Community College System.

3. Recommend the number and types of personnel who should serve at these workshops.
4. Specify the location and cost of these workshops.
5. Prepare an extensive paper showing how "what you plan" and "the outcomes you anticipate" will effectively serve the disadvantaged student.

The product of this two-day meeting was a proposal entitled "Learning Resources for the Disadvantaged Student." (Attachment #1)

This proposal was submitted to the Office of Vocational Education of the State Department of Education and was approved by them in the latter part of 1971. The grant was funded in the amount of \$42,361 for the period November 16, 1971 through June 30, 1972. A proposal requesting funding for the second year of the project will be submitted in the Summer of 1972.

A project director, then Director of Learning Resources at a community college in the System, was appointed. The project director reported to the Director of Curriculum and Instruction for the Virginia Department of Community Colleges.

Administrative delays involved with the proposal writing, approval, and implementation caused this project to be late in starting during the academic year. In fact, it was late in January, 1972, before the project was operational.

The first meeting of the advisory body was called at Richmond on January 31, 1972. As per the guidelines of the

proposal, local task force leaders were appointed on each campus in the System. To help with the planning for the content of the first major workshop, a questionnaire (Attachment #2) was developed. Twenty-three copies of the questionnaire were mailed and seventeen copies returned.

A meeting of all the task force leaders was held at Virginia Western Community College, Roanoke, Virginia on March 13, 1972. All colleges, operational at that time, were fully represented. Multi-campus colleges were represented by members from each campus. Particularly gratifying was the fact that Mountain Empire Community College, not scheduled for opening until the Fall of 1972, sent their Dean of Instruction. The research data of the local task force survey (Attachment #3) was used by the project director in the preparation of the program for Clinic Session #1.

The main event of the "year" was the workshop entitled "Learning Resources for the Disadvantaged Student" held at Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia on April 6-8, 1972. Each college in the System sent from three to five representatives, making a total attendance of eighty-eight directly involved with the disadvantaged student.

The program (Attachment #4) featured speakers who spoke at length on innovative learning systems specifically for utilization with occupational-technical disadvantaged students. All the sessions were recorded on audio-tape and duplicates were made afterwards and distributed to each campus in the System.

The composition of the gathering at Clinic #1 made it a

conference of a very general nature. However, several innovative ideas were discussed and it was the responsibility of the local task force leaders to return to their campuses and discuss ways of implementing these ideas with appropriate personnel. It was strongly recommended that the most effective manner in which this could be accomplished was through the division meetings.

Several task force leaders reported to the Director of the Project that the colleges were most receptive to their ideas and were in the process of determining new approaches to the teaching of disadvantaged students. Since the needs of each region vary, it was felt that a locally devised approach would be accepted much more easily than one imposed from without.

The final workshop was scheduled for May 31, 1972 at Roanoke, Virginia. This was a meeting where approximately seventy faculty from all operational colleges in the System had an opportunity to meet with colleagues in their own discipline. The purpose of the meeting was to identify strengths and weaknesses of learning resources in terms of their instructional support for the three major disciplines for disadvantaged students, i.e. Developmental English, Developmental Reading, and Developmental Mathematics.

Prior to this meeting, a list of discussion topics (Attachment #5) was forwarded to each task force leader with the request that each task force leader discuss with their task forces the strengths and weaknesses of learning resources at their college. The task force leader then presented a 5-minute

summary report at the May 31st meeting. This was found to be most useful as it gave those present the opportunity to hear what other colleges in the System were doing in learning resources including college strengths and weaknesses.

Following this general meeting, the group then met by discipline. This was a very satisfactory arrangement and most beneficial to all. Each discipline group included a counselor, an audio-visual specialist, a librarian, a coordinator of the learning laboratory and a learning resource director. With each of the above participants providing individual expertise, all personnel gained greater insight into the problems confronting instructors in these three disciplines.

At the conclusion of this meeting, each college was asked to send in suggestions for the following year's proposal.

SECTION 2

OUTCOMES AND PROBLEMS

Overall, there emerged from the workshop sessions an acknowledgement of the magnitude and complexity of the problem and the need to devote creativity to its solution. All who participated in the workshops acknowledged that they had gained an opportunity to learn through the sharing of experiences. The exchange of new knowledge and new techniques helped gain new insights and prompted the shaping of new horizons. The contact and the discussions between the personnel of the various colleges was a source of encouragement to them. They found themselves refreshed and even more determined to learn and improve their techniques of teaching the disadvantaged student.

Problems encountered in the first phase of the project were many. Working within the time frame of four months meant that many decisions were made at near crisis level. It was felt that there were many areas of concern to which much more time than that allocated could be devoted.

There was strong evidence to suggest that the stated mission of providing Developmental Studies within the comprehensive framework of the Virginia Community College System was not receiving the degree of emphasis in learning resources that is needed. Many expressed the view that until such time as a stronger philosophical educational commitment is made to

the needs of the disadvantaged, both systemwide and institution-wide, minimal success can be achieved. This point of view becomes particularly critical in terms of resource allocation and increased costs when specific needs are addressed. For example, reduced teaching loads and improved counselor/student ratios are essential ingredients. Additionally, administrative personnel must become genuinely involved, providing leadership and support to the faculty and counselors in upgrading instructional or learning resource emphasis for the disadvantaged student. Otherwise faculty members have no assurance, should research findings reveal a need for substantial program renovation or additional financial expenditures, that his findings, no matter how compelling, will be translated into practice.

One development that became apparent throughout all group activities involved in the project was the extent of attitudinal differences expressed by participants. This diversity of viewpoints surfaced both as an institutional manifestation and as an individual representative expression.

It became evident in the discussions that some of the participants did not have complete confidence in the existing testing and placement devices. An even more surprising fact that came to light was the wide diversity of cut-off scores utilized by different colleges even on the same measuring instruments.

Another area which evokes varying reactions was the question of regular learning time blocks as opposed to un-

restrained learning time. Grading practices was another related area that caused a widely divergent reaction as pertained to emphasizing success and deemphasizing failure for disadvantaged students. Methods and techniques of effective teaching/counseling also was a frequently discussed subject area in which extensive professional and attitudinal viewpoints exist. Finally, in terms of identifying components of specific research needed, there was a notable lack of consensus among institutional and discipline representatives.

Notwithstanding the existence of basic philosophical, professional, and attitudinal differences among the participants on substantive issues there was unanimity in the general appreciation expressed for the continuation and success of this project.

SECTION 3

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Most notable among the suggestions for next year's project was the development of three or four model programs on perhaps six or eight campuses. The details of such a "model" program approach will be included in the second-year proposal for federal funding, however, some general observations follow.

A series of in-service workshops would be necessary to introduce the colleges in the System to whichever model program best suited their needs. Sufficient planning would be required by the institutions involved in the pilot programs. Instructional planning would be needed before any hardware or software is purchased. Systems, viewed only as aids to instruction and available to instructors and students only as they want them, would probably be used very little, if at all.

The instructor is seen as an integral part of this model program approach since the developing of multi-media materials will affect his course. Too often in the past, exciting new advances in multi-media systems have failed because faculty have failed to comprehend the potential of the new technology. The instructor will determine the success or failure of the system, yet all too often he is the last to be consulted.

Many instructors involved in the pilot program will need

refresher training in identifying terminal behavioral objectives in measurable terms. The content structure required to arrive at these objectives will then require identification. This content structure must be examined to determine what can best be taught by automated tutorial systems, by large group lectures, by laboratory experience, by small group seminars or by other instructional techniques. Finally, the instructor will be given assistance in developing instructional materials and techniques.

To accomplish the above, the instructor must be free to create, test and evaluate his methods. Doubtless, the final multi-media instructional system developed will be a humanistic program relevant to the needs of the disadvantaged student.

As stated previously, success will result only if the institutions will regard financial support for innovative programs for disadvantaged students as one of their top priorities. Learning resources will then be viewed as not merely an aid to instruction but an integral part of the instructional process.

ATTACHMENT #1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Detailed Proposed Budget (First Year Costs)	
I. Title of Project	1
II. Statement of the Problem	1
III. Background Information and Related Research	2
IV. Objectives	8
V. Procedures	9
VI. Qualifications of Professional Personnel that will be Involved	14
VII. Other Information Pertinent to the Project	18
VIII. Chronological Time Schedule	19
IX. Plan for Dissemination of the Results of this Project	20
X. Plan for Self-Evaluation of Procedures Used and of Project	21
Project Summary Chart	22

I. Title of the Project "Learning Resources for the Disadvantaged Student"

An action research project for improving the success level of disadvantaged students in the Virginia Community College System within occupational-technical curricula through a clinical approach to the utilization of Learning Resources.

II. Statement of the Problem

The Community Colleges in Virginia are charged to provide higher education of an appropriate nature to all those who can profit from further education. The purpose of each college is to aid individual development and provide meaningful instructional curricula that assure success to the individual.

The Virginia Community College System established, at the outset, a framework in which meaningful and viable instructional programs would be developed for a heterogeneous student population with broadly differing needs. The framework now includes a Developmental Studies program which is intended, among other purposes, to provide educational readiness to enter into occupational-technical programs. However, a less than adequate job has been done in defining the placement and insuring the progress of the disadvantaged occupational-technical student from the point of entrance, through the instructional experiences of the program, and into successful employment. Implicit to the nature of the statewide system are the widely varied population characteristics of the regions served by each college. Accordingly systemwide needs may require varying solutions to best satisfy the localized emphasis desired.

Thus, the problem may be generalized into three segments as follows:

- A. To develop methods to improve initial placement into educational programs.

- B. To identify and harness a variety of learning resources to best serve individual needs.
- C. To structure those learning resources in a meaningful way, so as to prepare the disadvantaged student with the educational tools and psychological set to have a reasonable chance of success in his chosen curriculum and occupation.

III. Background Information and Related Research

A. National Perspective

Community Colleges throughout the nation are in varying degrees attempting to "open" educational and training doors to individuals who for one reason or another are "educationally disadvantaged." Many innovative ideas are underway in a variety of different institutional settings. In general terms it is probably correct to characterize these programs as attempts to take students from where they "are", in terms of educational ability level, and structure educational experiences in such a way as to prepare them for meaningful preparation for successful work in both the institutional and occupational sense. This involves programs variously referred to as Developmental Studies, Foundation Studies, Preparatory Skills, Remedial Work, or some such similar title. The important point is that regardless of the nomenclature applied to such programs, they are underway in most community colleges in order to help bridge the gap that separates a large number of students with academic deficiencies from educational and occupational opportunities.

The following quotation from Breaking the Access Barriers by Leland L. Medsker and Dale Tillery on this general subject in the context of the national scene is germane to the foregoing point:

Efforts to remedy learning deficiencies cut across all segments of the comprehensive program of the community college. It is estimated that 30 to 50 percent of students enter the open-door colleges in need of the basic skills required for college study. This is as true for those who aspire to advanced education as it is for those who seek preparation for employment. Some colleges have huge numbers of students who are seriously in need of remediation, while others have manageable numbers who need to improve their reading, writing, and mathematical skills. As barriers to educational opportunity are eliminated, students in need of help will "flood the community colleges and greatly exacerbate the present problems of providing developmental and remedial training . . ." (Collins and Collins, 1966).

The components of the developmental function are as follows:

Developmental reading is taught increasingly by trained reading specialists in properly equipped laboratories. There is little doubt that well-conducted reading programs are bringing many students up to reasonable standards in reading speed, comprehension, and vocabulary. Nevertheless, there still is a shortage of instructional materials which are properly graduated and which are stimulating to students who have few traditional academic interests.

Remedial composition probably accounts for greater effort on the part of college faculties--and more student suffering--than other aspects of the program. Even students with reading and mathematical competence may not be able to write. Increasingly, writing and spelling drill is being replaced by instruction to help students understand the nature and power of language. Transcriptions of oral reports, particularly for students of ethnic backgrounds, are being used for joint editing by students and tutors. Nevertheless, the standard yardstick for measuring student success is still the traditional freshman course in English composition. For many students, standards more relevant to occupations are needed.

Remedial programs in mathematics are increasingly important. Some students must renew basic arithmetic skills, while others must take, for the first time, beginning courses in the mathematics sequence which have been shifted in recent years to the high school level. "Illiteracy" in mathematics is seen as a threat to survival. Consequently, most community colleges require some achievement in mathematics as part of their general education requirements.

Learning skills have traditionally been considered a by-product of other aspects of remedial education. It is only recently that help for students who simply do not know how to learn has been viewed as an essential component of remediation.

Although routine courses in study habits are still common, many are being augmented by applied study of the psychology of motivation and learning.

Developmental speech courses are an increasingly popular and useful experience for community college students. Without the constraints which writing imposes on many people, oral communication can help students to organize their own thoughts and to understand and evaluate the views of others.

The student who is seriously handicapped in one of these basic skills often has difficulty in the others. Consequently, community colleges frequently develop core programs--sometimes euphemistically called opportunity programs--to concentrate efforts to bring handicapped students to reasonable proficiency in a reasonably short time. For some students, these concentrated programs have not provided opportunities for learning because they have tended to isolate low-achieving students from courses which really interest them and from students and faculty who might "turn them on." Generally, these core programs leave much to be desired. There is increasing awareness that the developmental function is everybody's business, not just that of the reading or speech therapist and certainly not just that of the hard-pressed English teacher.

In spite of the high percentage of students who need remedial courses, only half of their teachers consider such courses essential to the college program. Medsker's unpublished study (1967) of 57 junior colleges further shows that nearly one-fifth of the faculties believe that such courses actually are inappropriate. It may be that these attitudes help explain the continuation of practices in two-year colleges which seem so inconsistent with the needs of many of the new students. A few of these practices seem particularly central to the problems of educating the under-educated.

Remedial courses. Traditional remedial courses in the so-called basic skills depress teachers and students alike. They frequently ignore issues of motivation and the individual nature of learning problems. Nevertheless, the successes and failures of these massive efforts of remediation in the community colleges provide the basis for more effective programs, including tutorials, use of new learning techniques, and efforts to stimulate faith in ability to learn.

In a recent study of programs for poorly prepared students, Cross (1970) found that 80 percent of public community colleges have special provisions for students who do not meet the traditional academic requirements for college. Of those colleges, 92 percent offer developmental courses to upgrade verbal and other academic skills, although

only 61 percent have special counseling programs for remedial students. It is interesting to note the different practices among the colleges in awarding credit for remedial work: 25 percent offer none; 29 percent give non-degree credit; and 32 percent give degree credits.

There appears to be more concern about and more experimentation with development education than with any other component of the community college program. The new uses of learning technologies and individual tutorials are both promising and costly. It seems imperative that additional resources be brought to the efforts of reeducation. This will happen only if there is widespread conviction that such efforts are important if the community colleges are to fulfill their mission.¹

B. State Perspective

Developmental Studies in the VCCS are described as follows:

Developmental programs are offered to prepare individuals for admission to occupational-technical and university parallel-college transfer programs in the community college. These programs are designed to develop the basic skills and understandings necessary to succeed in the other programs of the community college. Approximately 75 percent of people completing developmental programs enter into occupational-technical programs.

Developmental Studies provide an opportunity to obtain needed knowledge and skills for an individual who is not fully prepared for entry into an associate degree program. This lack of preparation is usually caused by incompleteness or low achievement in previous educational endeavors. A student is placed in developmental studies after analysis of his high school transcript, test scores, and other achievement data.

¹Leland L. Medsker and Dale Tillery, Breaking the Access Barriers, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1971, pp. 65-68.

Through the use of specialized teaching methods and modern equipment, and with extensive concentration upon laboratory experiences, the student may progress at his own rate through concentrated effort in the areas of his weakness. Frequent testing reveals student progress.

The student may use either of two approaches to improve his knowledge and skills in developmental studies. In one approach he may enroll in the regular developmental courses scheduled each quarter at the community college. In the other approach the student may utilize, independent of the classroom, various course instructional materials in the areas of his deficiencies. Personnel in the Learning Laboratory or other faculty members of the college will be available to provide individualized student assistance. Progressing at his own rate, the student may complete the course at any time he demonstrates sufficient mastery to satisfy the minimum course requirements.

A student may be enrolled only in developmental studies or, if qualified, may enroll in a combination of degree and developmental courses. With the approval of the Dean of Instruction, some developmental courses may provide credit applicable to diploma and certificate programs. In addition, if the student enrolls simultaneously in degree and developmental courses, the credit earned in these degree courses may be transferred to an associate degree curriculum upon admission to the curriculum if these courses are applicable to the curriculum.

As previously mentioned in the statement of the problem, the adequacy of the job that is being done in this functional area is in question. Although each college in the System adheres to the open-door admission policy and has well-organized course work in Developmental Studies, i.e., mathematics, verbal studies, and reading skills, there

are many indicators of a need for innovative and demonstrable improvements, particularly for the occupational-technical disadvantaged student.

C. Related Research

A current project is underway to "Research and develop a master plan for the identification and accommodation of disadvantaged and handicapped students within the Virginia Community College System, Vocational Educational Programs." This project is being handled by consultants and the master plan resulting from this study will include among other objectives, methodology for the identification of disadvantaged and handicapped students, recommendations for special programs and instructional materials, and the identification of outside supporting agencies. This project will be completed by January, 1972. The results will be made available to the Director of the project described herein for appropriate consideration and implementation in the two year, in depth research and analysis of Learning Resources in the Virginia Community College System.

D. Definition of the Disadvantaged Community College Student

Disadvantaged persons are those identified to have academic, socio-economic, cultural, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in regular educational or training programs designed for persons without such handicaps, and who for that reason require specially designed programs or related services or both in order for them to benefit from the regular programs. This includes those persons whose needs result from poverty, neglect, delinquency, or cultural or linguistic isolation from the community at large, but does not include physically or mentally handicapped persons unless such handicapped persons also suffer from handicaps described above.

In further delineation of the characteristics of students which might explain the reason or reasons for such "disadvantaged" status the following generally apply, either singly or in combinations:

- (1) Personality, home or emotional problems
- (2) Members of families with low incomes
- (3) Low or underachiever
- (4) Behind one or more grades
- (5) Disinterested in educational program, possibly irregular in attendance
- (6) Lack of personal goals and/or a sense of purpose
- (7) Cultural or linguistic isolation
- (8) Normal or above in potential ability but failing to achieve for some reason

IV. Objectives

A. Overall (Phase 1 and Phase 2)

1. Utilizing the collective personnel and material resources of the Virginia Community College System plus consultants, determine ways and means to significantly improve Developmental Studies for disadvantaged students entering into occupational-technical programs.
2. Develop demonstrably successful learning systems which will maximize the community college learning experience for occupational-technical disadvantaged students.
3. Conduct training of community college faculty in the practical application of those learning systems found most beneficial for disadvantaged students entering into occupational-technical programs.

B. Sub-objectives

1. First Phase (First Year)

- a. Organize and complete a series of actions on a statewide, regional, and local basis which will marshal resources, document existing methodology of institutional approaches toward Developmental Studies, exchange success and failure teacher-learner experiences, assimilate views and recommendations of consultants, design and try out tentative strategies and techniques for statewide and localized applications of promising improvements in Developmental Studies.
- b. Design an appropriate group action research methodology for the Phase II (Second Year) segment of the project.

2. Second Phase (Second Year)

- a. Test various teaching methods, procedures, material resources to ascertain effectiveness in terms of student learning.
- b. Evaluate the entire project using both internal and external personnel.

V. Procedures

A. General

This project is viewed as a two year overall project made up of two phases. The first phase, which will take approximately one year, is the focus for this project proposal. The second phase, or the second year portion, will be generally outlined in concept at this time, but the detailed procedures applicable must await substantive developments which occur during the first year. In particular, the action research design for the second year portion of the project will be formulated during the latter stages of Phase 1 and included in a detailed project proposal to cover the Phase 2 segment.

The project will require stability in terms of the staff and faculty members previously involved so that requisite continuity may be assured. The key individual will be the Project Coordinator who will have over-all coordinative responsibilities for ensuring essential communications, synthesis of materials and reports, and dissemination of information. Assisting the Project Director in formulating guidance and instructions for localized Task Force undertakings at each of the community colleges will be a Statewide Coordinating Council of five or six individuals selected from within the System on the basis of expertise and interest.

Of particular importance to the concept of the two year overall research project is the delay of the action research design for the Phase 2 portion until well into the first year's activities. It will then be imperative for the Project Director and the Coordinating Council to structure a rigorous action research design which will include, as a minimum, the following essentials:

1. The identification of the problem area
2. The formulation of specific hypotheses or questions which bear directly on the overall objectives of the two year project.
3. The specific procedures to be utilized for testing alternative approaches to effectiveness in the use of learning resources, including data collection, recording, and statistical methodology, as appropriate.
4. An analysis of the evidence and inferential conclusions that can be drawn.
5. Recommendations for implementation of instructional and learner benefits.

B. Specific - Phase I

The initial effort will be devoted to organizational structuring, determination of guidelines, scheduling the first year activities, initiating Local Task Force studies of respective colleges, preparation of materials and data for a statewide clinic session, and the administration of the clinic session.

More particularly this sequence of tasks and accomplishments involved in this portion of the project will trace along the following described format.

Upon the approval of this proposal a Project Director will be acquired to provide the essential leadership, direction, organizational management, and information flow so necessary to the concept of a state directed and coordinated project involving 20 separate community colleges. As soon as practicable the Project Director will hold a planning session with the State-wide Coordinating Council for Project Orientation and Direction (Task 1). This Council of five or six members will have been selected by the Department of Community Colleges on the basis of expertise, interest, and regional representation. The function of this Council at this time will be to assist the Director in the initial stages of the project (Task 2). This assistance will essentially take the form of recommended guidelines for Local Task Force study of individual college practices regarding identification of the total range of entrance requirements for each curriculum, analysis of entering students' status, and prescription of the program for each student.

Within the guidelines and instructions promulgated from the State level, the Local Task Forces for each College will undertake a systematic study of their present practices pertaining to Developmental Studies (Task 3). This will include statements of educational and psychological

requirements for entrance to each vocational curriculum as established by the College, an investigation of diagnostic tools currently used, and the identification and description of methods used to prescribe for students. The data collected from this undertaking will be sent from each College to the Project Director for assimilation and preparation of working materials for the Clinic Session (Task 4).

This Clinic Session will be planned and called into meeting at an appropriate conference center (Task 5). The composition of this body will include the Local Task Forces from each College, the Project Director, the Statewide Coordinating Council, the Director of Curriculum and Instruction and member(s) of his staff, the Director of Student Services and member(s) of his staff, a group of five nationally recognized educational consultants, representatives from business and industry, and/or other persons with strong backgrounds in educational psychology, curriculum, vocational-technical fields, and tests and measurements. This clinic session will meet for three to five days and be directed toward reaching the following objectives:

1. Identify precise educational and psychological requirements for entrance to all curricula of the community colleges.
2. Transcribe these requirements into meaningful and useful terms for the purpose of testing and evaluating entry levels of students from all previous educational backgrounds.
3. Aid in developing capacities for diagnosis of educational and psychological deficiencies of students.
4. Enhance ability to follow diagnosis with prescription of educational programs that are positive in approach and intended to bring achievement of goals.

Following this, emphasis will shift to an implementation of the Clinic Session results on the basis of in-service workshops conducted at the respective colleges by the Local Task Forces (Task 6) and participation in regional meetings to compare directions and results (Task 7). Means will be developed for evaluating the implemented programs and for presenting these in report form and subsequently in second year activities. Working with instructional personnel at each College, the Local Task Forces will attempt to identify the learning problems that interfere with successful learning in the occupational-technical courses. An in-house study will be made of the problems of this nature and what is being done to assist in problem areas (Task 8). Further, suggestions will be made as to the kinds of activities necessary to help solve the learning problems of the "failing students". The Local Task Force will also evaluate the role of the Learning Resource Center, including strengths of materials in occupational-technical areas, both print and non-print, administrative structure and philosophy, current mode of supporting individual needs, specific instructional assistance for class use, and a survey of existing audio-visual equipment. As before, the Local Task Force will send to the Project Director relevant findings particularly directed to the data pertaining to the question of learning problems and needs (Task 9). This information will be synthesized by the Project Director for use in the organization and planning of second year activities.

When the Project Director and the Statewide Coordinating Council are clear on the procedural and substantive course this project is to follow, they will prepare the detailed activities for Phase II, including the design of an appropriate group action research project.

This will constitute the essentials for the second year portion of the overall project (Task 10).

C. Outline of Concept for Phase II

Apart from the group action research alluded to above, it is now anticipated that the Phase II, or second year, activities will involve the following:

1. Another Clinic Session conducted by regions (3)
2. Inputs from these clinics, providing summaries to the Project Director
3. Preparation of a State Master Plan for Learning Resource Centers
4. In-service, faculty training workshops
5. Evaluation

VI. Qualification of Professional Personnel

This section identifies key individuals who will or may be involved in this project. Those who can be identified with certainty are Dr. A. Martin Eldersveld, Director, Curriculum and Instruction, and Dr. John Lavery, Director, Student Services. Consultants who can be identified as prospective participants are Dr. Kenneth Clarke, Dr. Jerome Brunner, Dr. John Roueche, Dr. William Moore, and Dr. Max Raines. Although the name of the Project Director is unknown, a description of his desired qualifications will be shown. The members of the Statewide Coordinating Council and the Local Task Force are also considered as key professionals but specific data cannot be shown because these individuals are not yet identifiable.

Dr. A. Martin Eldersveld

Dr. Eldersveld is presently Director for Curriculum and Instruction, Department of Community Colleges. From 1962-1964 he was Associate Professor of Higher Education at Michigan State University and served in 1964-1965 as State Director, Bureau of Community Colleges, Pennsylvania. Dr. Eldersveld served as President of Prince George Community College in Suitland, Maryland from 1965 to 1967. He received a A.B. in 1946 from Calvin College. In 1956 he received a M.A. and in 1960 a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan.

Dr. John Lavery

Dr. Lavery is Director for Student Services, Virginia Department of Community Colleges. Previously he served as Dean of Students at Community College of Finger Lakes, Conandaigua, New York. Prior to that he served as Associate Dean, and Director of Financial Aids at State University of New York. Dr. Lavery holds an Ed.D. degree in college student personnel services from Michigan State University where he also received his M.A. in guidance and counseling.

Dr. John E. Roueche, Jr.

Dr. Roueche is at present Professor of Higher Education and Director of Community College Relations, University of Texas. He has previous experience as an instructor, Dean of Students, Assistant to the President, Associate Director, Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, and from 1968 to 1970 was Director of the Regional Educational Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia. Dr. Roueche received an A.A. Degree from Mitchell College, and A.B. from Lenoir-Rhyne College, M.A. from Appalachian State University and Ph.D. from Florida State University. He has numerous publications and holds several professional memberships.

Dr. William Moore, Jr.

Dr. Moore is President of Seattle Central Community College. For the past 18 years he has worked in varying capacities at the Forest Park Community College, St. Louis--the school that sends about half of its students on to further education. One of the few Black college presidents in the United States, Dr. Moore grew up in the ghetto and experienced all of the things his students talk about. He is perhaps more than anyone in higher education qualified to "tell it like it is," which he has done in Against the Odds.

Dr. Kenneth K. Clarke

Dr. Clarke has been a member of the faculty at Brooklyn Polytechnical Institute since 1955 and since 1967 has been the Director of the Graduate Engineering Division. He has had extensive experience in education both in the United States and abroad and is a consultant to government and industry.

Dr. Clarke received his undergraduate work from Cornell University, his master's degree in Electrical Engineering at Hanford University, and his doctorate in Electrical Engineering from Brooklyn Polytechnical Institute.

Dr. Jerome S. Bruner

Dr. Bruner is an eminent psychologist who has authored many books and articles in the general area of the process of education, learning theory, cognitive growth, and theory of instruction. Dr. Bruner received an A.B. from Duke in 1937, an A.M. from Duke in 1939, and a Ph.D. from Harvard in 1941. He has done extensive research, writing and consultative work. He was Chairman, Curriculum Study Group, National Academy of Sciences from 1959-1961 and has served as a Member, White House Panel on Educational Research and Development.

Dr. Max Raines

Dr. Raines is Professor of Higher Education and Director of the Community College Program, Michigan State University. Previously he served as Dean of Students, Flint Community College, Flint, Michigan and prior to that, as Director of Counseling at the same institution. Dr. Raines is a nationally known lecturer and recognized expert on student services. He serves on several national committees, including the American Association of Junior Colleges advisory committees. He has produced many publications in the fields of his educational expertise.

Project Director

The Project Director will work from the departmental level of the Virginia Community College System. He will be under the direct supervision of the Director of Curriculum and Instruction with the coordinative assistance of the Director of Student Services. He must have a minimum of a master's degree in an appropriate field and should have field experience in the utilization of learning resources.

Many of the qualifications required will be the outgrowth of interest and experience, and not necessarily of formal education. The following characteristics and capabilities are essential:

1. A working knowledge of community colleges
2. An understanding of the counseling and admissions functions of testing and placement
3. A strong belief in the worth of each individual student, and an appreciation of the psychological requirements of job placement
4. A working knowledge of individualized instruction and educational technology
5. Executive ability in organizing and synthesizing
6. A willingness to travel--it is projected that at least half of this person's time will be spent on college campuses and in regional workshops
7. The ability to move into strange and sometimes hostile situations with composure and objectivity
8. Edit and publish periodic progress reports
9. Expertise in writing a final report

VII. Other Information Pertinent to the Project

A. Statewide Coordinating Council for Project Orientation and Direction

Composition and Function

1. Five - six members, selected by Department of Community Colleges. Suggested composition of one member from each of the three identified regions; one from State Department, the others or to be selected from any of the Colleges on the basis of expertise and interest.
2. To begin working immediately to identify state-of-the-art survey requirements; to assess strengths, problems, weaknesses; examine current programs and plans within the System and in other Community Colleges.
3. To assist Project Director in initial stages of the program, in interpreting local needs, and in giving direction and forms to entire project.
4. To work in conjunction with the Project Director in the preparation of the action research design.

Leadership on Coordinating Council could change, due to normal attrition causes. Replacements should be from among Regional Leaders as they are identified.

B. Local Task Force

Composition and Function

1. The Local Task Force will consist of a total of three to five representatives to be selected from the following areas:
 - Learning Resource Center
 - Counseling
 - Development Studies Area
 - Faculty in Occupational-Technical Area
 - Students
2. The purpose of this group will be to administer the Project on their campus. They will coordinate the research and implementation throughout. Released time must be considered for the project responsibility. Specifically, they will:
 - a. Identify the educational and psychological requirements for entrance to each vocational curriculum as presently established for their college and determine how these are being used.
 - b. Suggest additional requirements that should be specified in order to insure success for students entering curriculum and how these can be determined.

- c. Investigate tools used for diagnosing learning disabilities and/or deficiencies and explain how they are being used.
- d. Suggest other information that is needed to diagnose properly incoming disadvantaged vocational students and ways in which these tools might be used.
- e. Identify the areas of weakness recognized in entry requirements to courses and full understanding of the resources the student brings with him.
- f. Describe the learning resources that are being used to remediate the deficiencies of these students. In detail describe the methods used in each course and attempt to identify reasons for student failure in each course. What kinds of things - space requirements, media, individualized instruction, etc. - would be helpful in the opinion of the college staff to help failing students succeed?
- g. Elaborate on any of the above; suggest to the Project Director any ideas that are relevant and that have not been covered in the above.

Specific responsibilities will be determined throughout the project.

C. Community College Regions to be Used for Project - Regional Assignments

<u>Eastern</u>	<u>Western</u>	<u>Northern</u>
Blue Ridge	Central Virginia	Germanna
Eastern Shore	Danville	Lord Fairfax
John Tyler	D. S. Lancaster	Northern Virginia
Paul D. Camp	New River	
Rappahannock	Patrick Henry	
Southside	Southwest	
Thomas Nelson	Virginia Highlands	
Tidewater	Virginia Western	
	Wytheville	

VIII. Chronological Time Schedule

The time sequence depicted here is initiated upon the approval of the project and the acquisition of a Project Director. However, any undue delay in naming such an individual will not hold up the initiation of the project. If necessary, although not desirable, the project can be started with an Acting Project Director assigned from existing staff resources.

Months 1-2	Identification of personnel	(Task 1)
	Guidelines promulgated	(Task 2)
Months 3-4	Local Task Force Study	(Task 3)
Mid-month 5	Local Task Force Send collected data to Project Director	(Task 4)
Month 6	Clinic Session	(Task 5)
Month 7-8	In-Service Workshops on Campus	(Task 6)
Month 9	Regional meetings	(Task 7)
Academic Term (Approx. 8-9-10 mo)	In-house study of learning problems	(Task 8)
Month 11	Local Task Force sends findings of study to Project Director	(Task 9)
Month 9-12	Preparation of Phase II, Second Year, details, including the action research design	(Task 10)

IX. Plan for Dissemination of the Results of This Project

The results of this project will be given appropriate national and state circulation depending to some extent on the degree of success achieved in meeting the needs of the disadvantaged in programs within the Virginia Community College System in occupational-technical fields.

At the national level distribution will be made to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, specifically to the Office of Education. Additionally, the Department of Labor may have some interest in this type project and will be included on the initial distribution. The American Association of Junior Colleges and the American Vocational Association will also be provided with copies. If the project has relevance and interest to others in the higher education community, it is expected that the report of the project will be entered into the Educational Resources Information Center. It is also likely that circulation of this report will

expressly include the National Laboratory for Higher Education and the Southern Regional Education Board.

At the State level principal distribution will include the Vocational Education Division, Department of Education, and all community colleges. Additionally, if the report is considered worthy of special attention, it will be circulated to members of the State Board for Community Colleges and other state agencies and institutions.

X. Plan for Self-Evaluation of Procedures Used and of Project

Evaluation of the Phase I portion of this project will be a matter of continuing functional importance throughout. The Project Director and the Statewide Coordinating Council will address this point in the initial guidelines structuring the various activities, or tasks, comprising the first years work. Specific details covering the evaluation function will be disseminated to insure uniformity in approach, particularly involving write-ups of results by Task Forces and Regional Clinics.

The action research design governing the Phase 2 activities and methodology will provide an objective mechanism for operational evaluation. Provision should be made for the use of outside consultants at some point in the final evaluation.

PROJECT SUMMARY CHART
Phase I

Objectives and Strategy	Task	Personnel Involved	Time Schedule	Expected Results
Project Organization and Procedures	1,2	Project Director Coordinating Council (6)	Months 1-2 (Oct.-Nov. 71)	Format for Local Task Force survey on cash campus. Working calendar for entire project. Guidelines
Collection of data concerning present practices involved in Phase I	3	Local Task Force on each campus	Months 3-4 (Dec. 71-Jan. 72)	State-of-the-art analysis of present practices
Data accumulation and dissemination preparatory to Clinic Session I	4	Local Task Force and Project Director	Mid-month 5 (Feb. 72)	Format for Clinic Session I
Clinic Session I--Procedures and relationships - 3-day conference--large and small group discussions	5	Project Director, Coordinating Council Local Task Forces, Consultants, Dept. Staff	Month 6 (Mar. 72)	Design for campus implementation, regional cooperation, and state coordination
Campus Workshop-Directed by Local Task Force Leader implementing gains at clinic, providing handouts and re-source personnel as identified at Clinic I. Evaluation	6	Local Task Force - campus level Faculty Students	Month 7-8 (Apr.-May 72)	Emergence of local objectives and implementation of new strategies and techniques. Evaluation produces data and guidelines for successive clinics

Objectives and Strategy	Task	Personnel Involved	Time Schedule	Expected Results
Regional Meetings	7	Project Director, Local Task Forces	Month 9 (June 72)	Evaluation of Implementation and progress of implementation. Direction for remainder of Phase I
In-house study of learning problems Findings provided to Project Director	8 9	Local Task Forces Faculty Project Director	Months 8-9-10 (or delayed as necessary for regular academic quarter) (Sept-Nov 72)	Format for Clinic Session II
Details of Phase II, (Second Year) including action re- source design	10	Project Director State- wide Coordinating Council	Months 9-11	Second year plans-basis for additional proposal

ATTACHMENT #2

STATE-OF-THE-ART ANALYSIS OF PRESENT PRACTICES

LOCAL TASK FORCE SURVEY

(Use separate sheet when necessary)

1. Do specific requirements exist for entrance into each vocational curriculum?
Please list.

- (a) Do specific requirements exist for entrance into any courses? (Exclusive of prerequisites as stated in the catalog)

2. Are there any criteria for exclusion?

3. Do you have specific recommendation and suggestion towards insuring success for students entering a curriculum?

4. What instruments do you use for testing and placement? What are the cut-off scores used on your campus?

- (1) CGP
- (2) Nelson-Denney
- (3) SRA Basic Arithmetic Skill
- (4) SRA Writing Skill
- (5) Psychological Corporation Dexterity Skill
- (6) Diagnostic Reading Test
- (7) In-house Tests (Please provide a copy of each with answer sheets.)
- (8) Other

5. Do you use any of the Virginia Employment Commission tests? If so, please list.

6. What information do you feel is needed for properly diagnosing incoming disadvantaged vocational students and identifying areas of weaknesses?

7. What criteria are used to indicate that a student has achieved sufficient competency in developmental work to move into college credit courses?

8. Describe the learning resources that are being used to remediate the deficiencies of these students. Describe the methods used in each course and attempt to identify reasons for student failure in each course. What kinds of things - space requirements, media, individualized instruction, etc. - would be helpful in the opinion of the college staff to help failing students succeed?

9. Elaborate on any of the above; suggest to the project director any ideas that you feel would be relevant and that have not been covered in the above.

ATTACHMENT #3

THOMAS NELSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

DRAWER "K" • RIVERDALE STATION • HAMPTON, VIRGINIA 23366 • PHONE (703) 826-4800

MEMORANDUM

TO: Local Task Force Leaders
FROM: Leo P. Rossiter, Project Director *L.P.R.*
DATE: April 28, 1972
SUBJECT: Results of Local Task Force Survey

You will remember that we recently completed a state-of-the-arts analysis of present practices at the community colleges as they pertain to disadvantaged students. The purpose of this questionnaire was to investigate diagnostic tools presently being administered to students preparing to enter occupational-technical curricula and to identify and describe methods used in the teaching of these students.

The research data collected from this survey was used by the project director in the preparation of the program for Clinic Session I. Consultants, with expertise in the problem areas identified by the questionnaire, were brought together to a three day workshop at Airlie Convention Center. Twenty questionnaires were mailed and seventeen returned. The following is a summary of the results of this survey.

Question 1: Do specific requirements exist for entrance into each vocational curriculum?

The common trend noted in a review of requirements at the various colleges is of course a proficiency in English and Mathematics. Certain stringent requirements are exacted for such areas as Nursing, Police Science, and Civil and Electrical Technologies, which are contingent upon both content and future employment.

The "open door" is a token, permitting many students access to Developmental Programs -- when the student is identified -- or to certain failure in academic areas when an adequate background is not presented.

Certain recommendations and questions emerged as a result of analysis of the survey statements.

To: Local Task Force Leaders
Subject: Results of Local Task Force Survey
Date: April 28, 1972
Page 2

1. Math requirements should be examined to determine their realistic role as a prerequisite. If the specific math needs of a program were identified, it would be possible to select from a modularized Developmental Math program to enable the student to meet needs directly related to that program.

2. Many programs require a "C" average in high school. This requirement may not be realistic, dependent upon the course work reflected, the amount of time lapse since high school, and the motivation and environment at that time. The "C" average should be reconsidered as a prerequisite.

3. Are occupational requirements actually reflected in the course content of a program? How current is our evaluation of the validity of the program in relation to future employment?

4. Should we consider developing a general vocational training program which could apply to a number of occupational areas? The identification of common skills, applicable to a number of areas, would reduce the number of programs, and with appropriate electives, could give a student both broad cognitive skills and an area of specialization.

5. Is the stringent Math requirement for certain programs (ex., Nursing) an essential part of the discipline, or is it used as a part of a screening-out process? Programs should be analyzed to see if the requisite Math is an actual tool in the program or a means of restricting entry.

6. What does "Proficiency in English" mean?

Question 2: Are there any criteria for exclusion?

The response to this question indicated that once the criteria for entrance were met, as reflected in Question 1, then entrance was automatic.

Question 3: Do you have specific recommendation and suggestion towards insuring success for students entering a curriculum?

A number of disadvantaged students come to the community colleges with very little idea of what curriculum they wish to pursue. A greater emphasis on career days on the part of the high school is very much in order. Here it was felt that articulation between community college counselors and their counterparts in the high school, would fill a need in this area. The question was raised as to whether a more in-depth

To: Local Task Force Leaders
Subject: Results of Local Task Force Survey
Date: April 28, 1972
Page 3

career day should take place on the college campus. The student, having been exposed to college level courses might wish to reset his goals.

Knowledge of the grading practices at all the high schools is most desirable. As much information as possible should be given to the faculty advisor responsible for the students progress. Correct use of intensive diagnostic tests and constant feedback by the faculty advisor would be extremely helpful to counselor, instructor, and student.

There seems to be general discontent with orientation, in its present form. However, no concrete proposals for improvement were put forward.

The need for better prediction devices was strongly emphasized. If such tests were available, it was felt that the student would understand exactly what he/she was getting into.

A commitment on the part of the colleges in regard to research in this area is badly needed.

Question 4: What instruments do you use for testing and placement?
What are the cut-off scores used on your campus?

C.G.P.: 15 colleges reported using the C.G.P. Of this number,
9 reported no cut-off score,
4 reported use of specific cut-off scores,
2 reported use of varying cut-off scores.

Nelson-Denney: 9 colleges reported use of Nelson-Denney.

SRA Basic Arithmetic Skill: 2 colleges reported use of this test.

SRA Writing Skill: 1 college reported use of this test.

Psychological Corporation Dexterity Skill: 0 college reported use of this test.

Diagnostic Reading Test: 6 colleges reported use of this test.

In-house Tests: 7 colleges reported use of various in-house tests.

Other: A total of 24 other tests were reported to be in use. Of this number, 11 were reported to be required at some colleges and 13 were being used on a voluntary basis at some colleges.

To: Local Task Force Leaders
Subject: Results of Local Task Force Survey
Date: April 28, 1972
Page 4

In summary, therefore, the data showed that there are a variety of testing and placement procedures being used by the seventeen colleges in the sample. C.G.P. is the most frequently used test (88%). However, 60% of the colleges using the C.G.P. are not using cut-off scores, while 40% are using a variety of cut-off scores.

The varied use of so many different types of tests in addition to the C.G.P. suggests that efforts have been made by the Virginia Community Colleges to more than meet the local needs for testing and placement. No evidence whatsoever was found of any coordinated approach among the seventeen colleges.

Question 5: Do you use any of the Virginia Employment Commission Tests?

Of the seventeen responses, eight reported "no" and one reported "sometimes".

Seven reported use of the G.A.T.B., each with some reservation. Of this number, one reported using it for vocational counseling; one for dental students; one for medical laboratory assistants; one for manual dexterity; two to a limited extent.

V.E.C. tests are available in the continuing education department of one college.

A dean of student services who had prior experience in the use of V.E.C. tests, in the North Carolina Community College System, was against the G.A.T.B. He felt that one of the many problems associated with the use of this test was that the cut-off scores used by the V.E.C. were designed to "screen out" students. One of the responsibilities of the community college is rather to "screen in" or identify students who have special educational needs.

R.F.U. Reading Tests and 2600 Pre-tests were listed under this question, although they are not V.E.C. tests.

Question 6: What information do you feel is needed for properly diagnosing incoming disadvantaged vocational students and identifying areas of weaknesses?

Responses to this question were indeed varied. The complete listing of all the suggestions is as follows:

(1) Testing

- (a) Diagnostic Test Scores
- (b) Proficiency Test Scores
- (c) C.G.P.

To: Local Task Force Leaders
Subject: Results of Local Task Force Survey
Date: April 28, 1972
Page 5

- (d) Knowledge of student's artistic ability
- (e) Knowledge of student's mechanical ability
- (f) Manual dexterity test
- (g) Standardized departmental tests for reading skills, writing skills, mathematic skills
- (h) Vocational aptitude tests
- (i) G.E.D.

(2) Selective Devices

- (a) Interest Inventories
- (b) Aptitude Inventories
- (c) G.A.T.B.

(3) Physical Screening

Here it was noted that a large percentage of disadvantaged students do some laboratory work. Since a great deal of the instruction involves audio-visual material and equipment, it was felt that vision and hearing tests be given before the students begin to work in the laboratory. Physical deformities should also be noted.

(4) History Log

- (a) Does the student have related job experience?
- (b) Educational background - has the student taken any courses relating to his intended major? At some colleges it was indicated that the high school records of part-time students are not provided.
- (c) Economic background
- (d) High school faculty evaluations in specific subject areas

(5) Counseling

Most colleges indicated a greater need for individual and small group counseling.

(6) Miscellaneous

- (a) Tests to predict student's response to programmed material.
- (b) Some method of differentiating between students capable of succeeding in degree occupational-technical programs and those students needing placement in certificate programs.

To: Local Task Force Leaders
Subject: Results of Local Task Force Survey
Date: April 28, 1972
Page 6

It is evident that all the colleges are really seeking solutions to the many problems in the area of identifying the weaknesses and strengths of disadvantaged students. They are striving to find the best instructional methods for these students. Mention was made of the Oakland Community College much publicized system of cognitive style mapping.

A great need for faculty and counselors, specially trained in working with disadvantaged students, was felt. Frequent meetings between these and the student, especially in the first few critical weeks, seemed most important.

Question 7: What criteria are used to indicate that a student has achieved sufficient competency in developmental work to move into college credit courses?

The word "standard" is an often used word but seemed to be left to the interpretation of the individual instructor and/or college.

Most testing seemed to be of the "in-house" variety, with a wide diversity of content from one college to another.

A minority of colleges reported using behavioral objectives. Some used separate testing, others did not.

Most colleges listed "instructor evaluation" as the criteria for advancement from developmental work into college credit courses. A few places advance students on "successful completion."

Several colleges reported using programmed materials with packaged tests, while "lab 99" (see attachment) is used at two colleges.

Question 8: Describe the learning resources that are being used to remediate the deficiencies of these students.
Describe the methods used in each course and attempt to identify reasons for student failure in each course.
What kinds of things - space requirements, media, individualized instruction, etc. - would be helpful in the opinion of the college staff to help failing students succeed?

Methods used:

- (a) Lecture-laboratory
- (b) Individualized instruction
- (c) Programmed materials
- (d) Tutorials - instructors and peers
- (e) Audio-visual aids

To: Local Task Force Leaders
Subject: Results of Local Task Force Survey
Date: April 28, 1972
Page 7

Reasons for failure:

- (a) Deficiencies in preparation
- (b) Classes too large
- (c) Inadequate staff
- (d) Lack of motivation
- (e) Lack of study skills
- (f) Frustration at inability to overcome deficiencies immediately
- (g) Conflict between class schedules and work schedules
- (h) Failure to establish realistic educational goals

What would be helpful in aiding failing students and helping them to succeed:

- (a) Better counseling
- (b) Diagnosis of problem areas
- (c) Teacher training
- (d) Smaller classes
- (e) Time and money for research and evaluation

In conclusion, I wish to thank all the task forces for the competent professional contribution they made in answering the questionnaire. On reading this summary, I feel you will understand some of the problems which you and your colleagues are confronted with, some of them daily. The results indicate the real need that exists for our project to come up with definite recommendations to help solve some of these problems.

cc: Dr. A. Martin Eldersveld
Dr. John Lavery
Dr. Fred Snyder

A RATIONALE FOR
DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION AT
VIRGINIA HIGHLANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

S U M M A R Y

As a part of the overall commitment to comprehensive educational opportunity, Virginia Highlands Community College is dedicated to the proposition that the college must provide means by which previous academic deficiencies can be corrected. In the past the "foundations" program has been the only means for accomplishing this goal. Unfortunately, foundations programs have not generally proven to be effective in that few students complete the programs and move into a curriculum.

The program of developmental studies at Virginia Highlands Community College is divided into two parts. The first provides opportunities to take prerequisite high school courses which the student did not take while in high school. Both programmed instruction and regular classes are provided. For the student who has been exposed to the subject in high school but who has failed to attain the required level of proficiency, a non-traditional plan has been developed.

Prepared by Dr. George E. Vaughan, Dean of Instruction, and
Dr. Donald E. Puyear, President, Virginia Highlands Community
College

Where true remediation is necessary, the great majority of students in foundations programs have failed to achieve their goals. The year without credit toward graduation is deadening to initiative and to the ego. The chances of correcting deficiencies that have been developing over twelve or more years by using essentially the same techniques that failed in the first place are small indeed. The Virginia Highlands Plan [which uses only courses available to all colleges in the Virginia Community College System] involves attaching an English or mathematics laboratory [Supervised Study] to a required course in these basic "tool" subjects for those having deficiencies in their academic preparation. The student and the instructor now have the time necessary to make it possible for the student to succeed. His effective course load is reduced by the laboratory. While the laboratory is a credit course in the sense that it is a part of the course load, credits earned are not applicable toward graduation in degree programs. [The courses used are MATH 99 and ENGL 99; courses of "less than degree level."] Since the same instructor conducts the laboratory and teaches the course, there is direct relevance between the two. Most of the motivation problems associated with the old methods are expected to be eliminated.

Note: Material in brackets to be deleted if PUBLISHED outside the System.

ATTACHMENT #4



LEARNING RESOURCES
FOR THE
DISADVANTAGED
STUDENT

AIRLIE HOUSE
AIRLIE, VIRGINIA
APRIL 6-8, 1972

CLINIC SESSION #1

Presiding:

Mr. Leo P. Rossiter
Project Director
Thomas Nelson Community College

NOTES

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1972

11:30 to
1:30 p.m. REGISTRATION

12:30 to
1:30 p.m. LUNCH

1:30 to
2:45 p.m. FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Welcome: MR. LEO P. ROSSITER
Project Director
Thomas Nelson Community
College

Presiding: MR. DON SMITH
Coordinator of Admissions and
Records
Southwest Virginia Community
College

Address: DR. DAVID NOLAN
Director

Topic Educational Testing Services
"Effective Use of Measurement
Instruments in a Community
College System"

2:45 to
3:15 p.m. Individual Local Task-Force Meetings
(See bulletin board for meeting room.)

3:15 to
4:30 p.m. CONTINUE FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Question and Answer Period

5:00 to
6:00 p.m. CASH BAR

6:00 to
7:00 p.m. DINNER

7:30 to
8:15 p.m. SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: MR. MICHAEL SAKMAR
Director of Learning Resources
Germanna Community College

Address: MR. PAUL KAZMIERSKI
Director, Reading and Study
Clinic

Topic: Rochester Institute of Technology
*"Trends and Developments in
Reading and Study at the
Community College Level"*

8:15 to
8:45 p.m. Individual Local Task Force Meetings
(See bulletin board for meeting room.)

9:00 to
10:00 p.m. CASH BAR

FRIDAY, APRIL 7, 1972

9:00 to
10:00 a.m. CONTINUE SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Question and Answer Period

10:00 to
10:30 a.m. COFFEE

10:30 to
11:15 a.m. THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Gloria Terwilliger
Director, Learning Resource
Center
Northern Virginia Community
College

Address: MRS. DORIS WEDDINGTON
Instructor, Communications
Department
Central Piedmont Community
College

Topic: "Communication Skills - A
Relevant, Individualized,
Personalized Approach"

11:15 to
11:45 a.m. Individual Local Task Force Meetings
(See bulletin board for meeting room.)

12:00 to
1:00 p.m. LUNCH

1:15 to
2:15 p.m. CONTINUE THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Question and Answer Period

2:15 to
2:45 p.m. FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: MR. JAMES PRESGRAVES
Chairman, Developmental Studies
Wytheville Community College
Address: MR. TERRENCE A. TOLLEFSON
Director, Junior and Community
Colleges Division
National Laboratory for Higher
Education
Topic: *"Individualized Instruction"*

2:45 to
3:15 p.m. Individual Local Task Force Meetings / Coffee
(See bulletin board for meeting room.)

3:15 to
4:15 p.m. CONTINUE FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

Question and Answer Period

4:15 to
5:00 p.m. FIFTH GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: DR. HENRY REJENT
Chairman, Developmental Studies
Tidewater Community College
Address: DR. JOHN ROUECHE
Professor of Junior College
Education
University of Texas
Topic: *"The Developmental Student,
1972 Model - A Fresh Look"*

5:15 to
6:30 p.m. CASH BAR

6:30 to
7:30 p.m. DINNER

7:45 to
8:45 p.m. PANEL DISCUSSION

Moderator: MR. THOMAS H. RATLEDGE
Dean of Instruction
Thomas Nelson Community College
Consultants, Faculty, Students

9:00 to
10:00 p.m. CASH BAR

SATURDAY, APRIL 8, 1972

9:00 to
9:45 a.m. SIXTH GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: MR. CYRIL SYKES
Director of Learning Resources
Virginia Western Community
College

Address: MR. RALPH MANSFIELD
Chairman, Mathematics Department
Chicago City (Loop) College

Topic: *"Mathematics for the
Disadvantaged Student"*

9:45 to
10:15 a.m. Individual Local Task Force Meetings
(See bulletin board for meeting room.)

10:15 to
11:15 a.m. CONTINUE SIXTH GENERAL SESSION

Question and Answer Period

12:00 noon COOKOUT and CASH BAR

ATTACHMENT #5

DISCUSSION TOPICS

1. Name of Institution _____
2. Total headcount of students enrolled in academic year 1971-1972 as follows:
 - a. Fall Quarter _____
 - b. Winter Quarter _____
 - c. Spring Quarter _____
3. Number of students enrolled in Developmental Studies (English, Mathematics, Reading) for the same academic year.
 - a. Fall Quarter _____
 - b. Winter Quarter _____
 - c. Spring Quarter _____
4. In terms of general evaluation of your college's Learning Resources, what has worked well for you in each of the three subject matter areas and, briefly, how do you account for this success?
 - a. English:

Why?

b. Mathematics:

Why?

c. Reading:

Why?

What has worked poorly for you in each of the three subject matter areas and, briefly, how do you account for this lack of success?

a. English:

Why?

b. Mathematics:

Why?

c. Reading:

Why?

What special problems on your campus must be dealt with for Learning Resources to be more effective for the disadvantaged student?

a. English:

b. Mathematics:

c. Reading:

7. What situations must be changed in order to deal with the above problems more effectively?

a. Problem 6a (English):

b. Problem 6b (Mathematics):

c. Problem 6c (Reading):

What obstacles to changing the above mentioned situations exist?

a. Situations 7a (English):

b. Situations 7b (Mathematics):

c. Situations 7c (Reading);

What alternative solutions do you see?

10. Suggested action research activities for the project design next year.